

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the final Office Action dated February 26, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. No new matter has been introduced by this Response; thus, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

35 USC §102/103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 14-18, 52 and 61-66 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Sehr (U.S. Patent No. 6,085,976) and under 35 USC §103(q) as being unpatentable over Laval in view of Goldstein.

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse such rejections. The Office Action states that the reference Sehr and the reference Goldstein disclose, “generated event information including an event location and wherein the event location includes plurality of seating arrangements.” Applicants respectfully disagree. For the reasons cited below. However, in the spirit of corporation, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 14 and 52 for clarity.

Claim 1 now reads, in part, “wherein the event location includes plurality of configurations of seating arrangements seats in the event location.” Claims 14 and 52 contain similar language.

The Office Action cites Sehr in col. 15 lines 37-67. The cited section of Sehr makes no mention of an event location having a plurality of configurations of seats in a given event location as claimed and fully supported by the specification. For example, see Sehr in col. 15 line 43 stating, “display **the** seating guide,” implying a single seating guide. Additionally, the remainder of Sehr does not disclose or suggest an event venue having a plurality of seating arrangements available.

The Office Action cites Goldstein in col. 7 lines 45-56. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion, and the remainder of Goldstein, fail to disclose an event location having a plurality configurations of seats in a given event location. The reference Goldstein merely refers to selecting an event and selecting the type of seats. The reference Goldstein fails to mention any ability to set different seating arrangements for an event.

For at least the foregoing reasons Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 14 and 52, and the Claims that depend therefrom are patentably distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

In addition to the reasons cited above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 14 and 52 have been further amended in the spirit of cooperation.

Claim 1 now reads, in part, “an outputting apparatus for outputting an event seating information sheet.” Claims 14 and 52 contain similar language.

The amendments are fully supported by the specification. For example, see the specification on page 36 lines 10-23 stating, in part, “The vacant seat information can be displayed or printed out. In the output sheet image 3300 shown in FIG. 33, sold seats are indicated by hatched portions, and unsold seats are indicated in blank.”

The references fail to disclose an output for outputting an event seating information sheet as is claimed and fully supported by the specification.

For at least the foregoing reasons Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 14 and 52, and the Claims that depend therefrom are patentably distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer No. 29175

Dated: April 18, 2008